

SEP 08 1999

Louis E. Ginochio
3401 Walnut Avenue
Concord, CA 94519-2435
(925) 685-2391 FAX 686-0728

Comments to CALFED hearing held at Antioch, CA on Sept. 8, 1999

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight on a subject which can impact the lives of many farmers and ranchers in this county and the area.

I wish to add to what others have said or will say tonight, hopefully without too much repetition that additional attention must be paid to the detrimental consequences that will accrue if the proposal goes forward without considerable changes.

The solutions to water availability, quality, assurance, etc., for all including farmers (we are humans too!), metropolitan and industrial users, as well as, needs of the environment and habitat for all other dependent species lie in providing something for the preservation of all--not simply denial of water to one element of God's creatures to the detriment of all others.

To proceed with the proposal as currently presented, does little, if anything to provide additional storage, identify and utilize other sources not currently maximized, or even recognize the adverse economic effects on the community, state and nation, let alone, the farmers directly affected by "taking farmland out of production".

The "domino" effect of reducing farmland will be felt at the local level by reduction in needs, goods and services of the farmers displaced by this scheme. Also, farmworkers, the local grocer, department store, etc. dependent upon those who make a living from farms and farming will disappear.

The smaller production of food and fiber will also impact the state and national economy in that California agriculture contribute very significantly to the balance of trade, especially in the Pacific Rim countries, with whom we exchange goods and services. While it may be difficult to quantify, it is a fact of life that farmers and their workers will be displaced.

Other pertinent key factors relate to the development of other water sources. Most obvious are the northern California rivers, like the Eel, Van Duzen, Smith, Klamath and others that are "free-flowing" to the ocean, with little utilization of that vast resource. To dismiss this potential source, with out further scrutiny, is

SEP 08 1999

ludicrous. Arguments, "that legislation has made their use impossible" won't fly --because legislation that made them "untouchable" can be reversed if a sufficient need exists.

Additional storage facilities need to be addressed as well. Transport facilities, be they canal, cross-Delta waterways, seem also to have been dismissed in the study.

The CalFed process must return a course of action which will result in a system that provides benefit for both man and wildlife. Farmers and Fish can both be winners.

Some of the assumptions (even wet years did not help the smelt problem in the Delta) are, at best, suspect and need to be more thoroughly investigated, rather than to simply "idle" hundreds of thousands of productive farmable acres--the heart of California and some of the nation's most productive lands.

Please consider a more exhaustive review of the proposed system, which can leave room of the other "endangered species" known as the California Farmer.

Thank you again for this opportunity to give my comments.


Louis E. Ginochio